arXiv:1405.2717v1 [math.PR] 12 May 2014

Continuum AB percolation and AB random geometric graphs

Mathew D. Penrose[1]
University of Bath

May 13, 2014

Abstract

Consider a bipartite random geometric graph on the union of two independent homogeneous Poisson point processes in d-space, with distance parameter r and intensities λ, μ. We show for $d \geq 2$ that if λ is supercritical for the one-type random geometric graph with distance parameter $2r$, there exists μ such that (λ, μ) is supercritical (this was previously known for $d = 2$). For $d = 2$ we also consider the restriction of this graph to points in the unit square. Taking $\mu = \tau\lambda$ for fixed τ, we give a strong law of large numbers as $\lambda \to \infty$, for the connectivity threshold of this graph.

1 Introduction and statement of results

The continuum AB percolation model, introduced by Iyer and Yogeshwaran [3], goes as follows. Particles of two types A and B are scattered randomly in Euclidean space as two independent Poisson processes, and edges are added between particles of opposite type that are sufficiently close together. This provides a continuum analogue to lattice AB percolation which is discussed in e.g. [2]. Motivation for considering continuum AB percolation is discussed in detail in [3]; the main motivation comes from wireless communications networks with two types of transmitter.

Another type of continuum percolation model with two types of particle is the *secrecy random graph* [9] in which the type B particles (representing eavesdroppers) inhibit percolation; each type A particle may send a message to every other type A

[1] Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Bath, Bath BA2 7AY, United Kingdom: m.d.penrose@bath.ac.uk

particle lying closer than its nearest neighbour of type B. See also [7]. Such models are not considered here but are complementary to ours.

To describe continuum AB percolation more precisely, we make some definitions. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Given any two locally finite sets $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and given $r > 0$, let $G(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, r)$ be the bipartite graph with vertex sets $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, and with an undirected edge $\{X, Y\}$ included for each $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $\|X - Y\| \leq r$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (our parameter r would be denoted by $2r$ in the notation of [3].) Also, let $G(\mathcal{X}, r)$ be the graph with vertex set $\mathcal{X}$ and with an undirected edge $\{X, X'\}$ included for each $X, X' \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\|X - X'\| \leq r$.

For $\lambda, \mu > 0$ let $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$, $\mathcal{Q}_\mu$ be independent homogeneous Poisson point processes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of intensity λ, μ respectively, where we view each point process as a random subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Our first results are concerned with the bipartite graph $G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \mathcal{Q}_\mu, r)$.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the class of graphs having at least one infinite component. By a version of the Kolmogorov zero-one law, given parameters r, λ, μ (and d), we have $\mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \mathcal{Q}_\mu, r) \in \mathcal{I}] \in \{0, 1\}$. Provided r, λ, and μ are sufficiently big, we have $\mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \mathcal{Q}_\mu, r) \in \mathcal{I}] = 1$; see [3], or the discussion below. Set

$$\mu_c(r, \lambda) := \inf\{\mu : \mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \mathcal{Q}_\mu, r) \in \mathcal{I}] = 1\},$$

with the infimum of the empty set interpreted as $+\infty$. Also, for the more standard one-type continuum percolation graph $G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, r)$, define

$$\lambda_c(2r) := \inf\{\lambda : \mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, 2r) \in \mathcal{I}] = 1\},$$

which is well known to be finite for $d \geq 2$ [2, 5], but is not known analytically. By scaling (see Proposition 2.11 of [5]) $\lambda_c(2r) = r^{-d}\lambda_c(2)$, and explicit bounds for $\lambda_c(2)$ are provided in [5]. Simulation studies indicate that $1 - e^{-\pi\lambda_c(2)} \approx 0.67635$ for $d = 2$ [8] and $1 - e^{-(4\pi/3)\lambda_c(2)} \approx 0.28957$ for $d = 3$ [4].

Obviously if $G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \mathcal{Q}_\mu, r) \in \mathcal{I}$ then also $G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, 2r) \in \mathcal{I}$, and therefore a necessary condition for $\mu_c(r, \lambda)$ to be finite is that $\lambda \geq \lambda_c(2r)$. In other words, for any $r > 0$ we have

$$\lambda_c^{AB}(r) := \inf\{\lambda : \mu_c(r, \lambda) < \infty\} \geq \lambda_c(2r). \tag{1.1}$$

For $d = 2$ only, Iyer and Yogeshwaran [3] show that the inequality in (1.1) is in fact an equality. For general $d \geq 2$, they also provide an explicit finite upper bound, here denoted $\tilde{\lambda}_c^{AB}$, for $\lambda_c^{AB}(r)$, and establish explicit upper bounds on $\mu_c(r, \lambda)$ for $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}_c^{AB}(r)$. Note that even for $d = 2$, their explicit upper bounds for $\mu_c(r, \lambda)$ are given only when $\lambda > \tilde{\lambda}_c^{AB}(r)$, with $\tilde{\lambda}_c^{AB}(r) > \lambda_c(2r)$ for all $d \geq 2$; for the case with $d = 2$ and $\lambda_c(2r) < \lambda \leq \tilde{\lambda}_c^{AB}(r)$ their proof that $\mu_c(r, \lambda) < \infty$ does not provide an explicit upper bound on $\mu_c(r, \lambda)$.

In our first result, proved in Section 2, we establish for all dimensions (and all $r > 0$) that the inequality in (1.1) is an equality, and provide explicit asymptotic upper bounds on $\mu_c(r, \lambda)$ as λ approaches $\lambda_c(2r)$ from above. Let π_d denote the volume of the unit radius ball in d dimensions.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $d \geq 2$ and $r > 0$. Then (i) $\lambda_c^{AB}(r) = \lambda_c(2r)$, and (ii) writing $\lambda_c = \lambda_c(2r)$ we have*

$$\limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left(\frac{\mu_c(r, \lambda_c + \delta)}{\delta^{-2d} |\log \delta|} \right) \leq \left(\frac{4\lambda_c^2}{r} \right)^d d^{3d}(d+1)\pi_d. \tag{1.2}$$

In Section 2 we provide the proof, which is based on the classic elementary continnum percolation techniques of discretisation, coupling and scaling. We shall also indicate how, for any given $\lambda > \lambda_c(2r)$, one can compute an explicit upper bound for $\mu_c(r, \lambda)$; see eqn (2.10).

It would be interesting to try to find complementary *lower* bounds for $\mu_c(r, \lambda)$. An analogous problem in the lattice is mixed bond-site percolation, which similarly has two parameters. For that model, similar questions have been studied by Chayes and Schonman [1], but it is not clear to what extent their methods can be adapted to the continuum.

Our second result concerns full connectivity for the *AB random geometric graph*, i.e. the restriction of the AB percolation model to points in a bounded region of $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $\lambda > 0$ let $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^F := \mathcal{P}_\lambda \cap [0,1]^d$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\lambda^F := \mathcal{Q}_\lambda \cap [0,1]^d$ (these are finite Poisson processes of intensity λ; hence the superscript F). Given also $\tau > 0$ and $r > 0$, let $\mathcal{G}^1(\lambda, \tau, r)$ be the graph on vertex set $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^F$, with an edge between each pair of vertices sharing at least one common neighbour in $G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda^F, \mathcal{Q}_{\tau\lambda}^F, r)$.

Let $\mathcal{G}^2(\lambda, \tau, r)$ be the graph on vertex set $\mathcal{Q}_{\tau\lambda}^F$, with an edge between each pair of vertices sharing at least one common neighbour in $G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda^F, \mathcal{Q}_{\tau\lambda}^F, r)$. Then $G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda^F, \mathcal{Q}_{\tau\lambda}^F, r)$ is connected, if and only if both $\mathcal{G}^1(\lambda, \tau, r)$ and $\mathcal{G}^2(\lambda, \tau, r)$ are connected.

Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the class of connected graphs, and let

$$\rho_n(\tau) = \min\{r : \mathcal{G}^1(n, \tau, r) \in \mathcal{K}\}$$

which is a random variable determined by the configuration of $(\mathcal{P}_n, \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n})$. It is a *connectivity threshold* for the AB random geometric graph. Let us assume $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^F$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\mu^F$, are coupled for all $\lambda, \mu > 0$ as follows. Let $(X_1, Y_1, X_2, Y_2, \ldots)$ be a sequence of independent uniform random d-vectors uniformly distributed over $[0,1]^d$. Independently, let $(N_t, t \geq 0)$ and $(N'_t, t \geq 0)$ be independent Poisson counting processes of rate 1. Let $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^F = \{X_1, \ldots, X_{N_\lambda}\}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\mu^F = \{Y_1, \ldots, Y_{N'_\mu}\}$.

In Section 3 we prove the following result, with $\xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}}$ denoting almost sure convergence as $n \to \infty$ (with $n \in \mathbb{N}$).

Theorem 1.2. *Assume $d = 2$. Let $\tau > 0$. Then*

$$n\pi(\rho_n(\tau))^2/\log n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \max(1/\tau, 1/4). \tag{1.3}$$

Remarks.

1. The restriction to $d = 2$ arises because boundary effects become more important in higher dimensions (and $d = 1$ is a different case). It should be possible to adapt the proof to obtain a similar result to (1.3) in the unit *torus* in arbitrary dimensions $d \geq 2$, namely $n\pi_d(\rho_n(\tau))^d/\log n \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \max(1/\tau, 2^{-d})$, although we have not checked the details.

2. Iyer and Yogeshwaran [3, Theorem 3.1] give almost sure lower and upper bounds for $\rho_n(\tau)$ in the torus. The extension of our result mentioned in the previous remark would show that the lower bound of [3] is sharp for $\tau \leq 2^d$, and improve on their upper bound.

Notation. Given a countable set $\mathcal{X}$, we write $|\mathcal{X}|$ for the number of elements of $\mathcal{X}$ and if also $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, given $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we write $\mathcal{X}(A)$ for $|\mathcal{X} \cap A|$. Also, for $a > 0$ we write aA for $\{ay : y \in A\}$. Let $\oplus$ denote Minkowski addition of sets (see e.g. [6]).

2 Percolation: proof of Theorem 1.1

Fix $r > 0$ and let $\lambda > \lambda_c(2r)$. We first prove that $\mu_c(r, \lambda) < \infty$; combined with (1.1) this shows that that $\lambda_c^{AB}(r) = \lambda_c(2r)$, which is part (i) of the theorem. Later we shall quantify the estimates in our argument, thereby establishing part (ii).

Choose $s < r$ and $\nu < \lambda$ such that $\mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\nu, 2s) \in \mathcal{I}] = 1$. This is possible because decreasing the radius slightly is equivalent to decreasing the Poisson intensity slightly, by scaling (see [5]; also the first equality of (2.7) below). Set $t = (r + s)/2$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be chosen small enough so that any cube of side ε has Euclidean diameter at most $t - s$. For $a > 0$ let $p_a := 1 - \exp(-\varepsilon^d a)$, the probability that a given cube of side ε contains at least one point of $\mathcal{P}_a$.

Consider Bernoulli site percolation on the graph $(\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d, \sim)$ where for $u, v \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ we put $u \sim v$ if and only if there exists $w \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $\|w - u\| \leq t$ and $\|w - v\| \leq t$. Given $p > 0$ suppose each site $u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ is independently occupied with probability p. Let D_1 be the event that there is an infinite path of occupied sites in the graph, and let $\mathbb{P}_p[D_1]$ be the probability that this event occurs.

Divide $\mathbb{R}^d$ into cubes $Q_u, u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$, defined by $Q_u := \{u\} \oplus [0, \varepsilon)^d$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ let $z_x \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ be such that $x \in Q_{z_x}$. The Poisson process $\mathcal{P}_\nu$ may be coupled to a realization of the site percolation process with parameter p_ν, by deeming each $z \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ to be occupied if and only if $\mathcal{P}_\nu(Q_z) \geq 1$. By the choice of ε, for $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}_\nu$,

if $\|X - Y\| \le 2s$ then $\|z_X - z_{(X+Y)/2}\| \le t$ and $\|z_Y - z_{(X+Y)/2}\| \le t$, and hence $z_X \sim z_Y$. Therefore, with this coupling, if $G(\mathcal{P}_\nu, 2s) \in \mathcal{I}$ then there is an infinite path of occupied sites in $(\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d, \sim)$. Since we chose ν, s so that $\mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\nu, 2s) \in \mathcal{I}] = 1$, we have $\mathbb{P}_{p_\nu}[D_1] = 1$.

Now consider a form of lattice AB percolation on $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ with parameter pair $(p, q) \in [0, 1]^2$ (not necessarily the same as any of the lattice AB percolation models in the literature). Let $(V_u, u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d)$ be a family of independent Bernoulli random variables with parameter p, and let $(W_u, u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d)$ be a family of independent Bernoulli random variables with parameter q. Let D_2 be the event that there is an infinite sequence $u_1, u_2, \ldots$, of distinct elements of $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$, and an infinite sequence $v_1, v_2, \ldots$, of elements of $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$, such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $V_{u_i} W_{v_i} = 1$ and $\max(\|u_i - v_i\|, \|v_i - u_{i+1}\|) \le t$. Let $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{p,q}[D_2]$ be the probability that event D_2 occurs, given the parameter pair (p, q).

Since $\mathbb{P}_{p_\nu}[D_1] = 1$, clearly $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{p_\nu,1}[D_2] = 1$. Increasing p slightly and decreasing q slightly, we shall show that there exists $q < 1$ such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_{p_\lambda,q}[D_2] = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

This is enough to demonstrate that $\mu_c(r, \lambda) < \infty$. Indeed, suppose such a q exists and choose μ such that $p_\mu = q$. Then for $u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ set $V_u = 1$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(Q_u) \ge 1$ and $W_u = 1$ if and only if $\mathcal{Q}_\mu(Q_u) \ge 1$. Suppose D_2 occurs and let $u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2, \ldots$ be as in the definition of event D_2. Then for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $V_{u_i} = 1$ so we can pick a point $X_i \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda \cap Q_{u_i}$, and $W_{v_i} = 1$ so we can pick a point $Y_i \in \mathcal{Q}_\mu \cap Q_{v_i}$. Then by the choice of ε, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\max(\|X_i - Y_i\|, \|Y_i - X_{i+1}\|) \le t + (t - s) = r,$$

and hence $G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \mathcal{Q}_\mu, r) \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, by (2.1) we have $\mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \mathcal{Q}_\mu, r) \in \mathcal{I}] = 1$. Therefore $\mu_c(r, \lambda) \le \mu < \infty$ as asserted.

To complete the proof of part (i), it remains to prove that (2.1) holds for some $q < 1$. Let $(T_u, u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d)$ be independent Bernoulli variables with parameter p_λ. For each ordered pair $(u, v) \in (\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d)^2$ with $0 < \|u - v\| \le t$, let $U_{u,v}$ be independent Bernoulli random variables with parameter $(p_\nu/p_\lambda)^{1/\Delta}$, where we set

$$\Delta := |\{u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d : 0 < \|u\| \le t\}|. \tag{2.2}$$

Assume the variables $U_{u,v}$ and T_u are all mutually independent. Then for $u, v \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ define the Bernoulli variables

$$V_u := T_u \prod_{v \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d : 0 < \|v-u\| \le t} U_{u,v}; \tag{2.3}$$

$$W_v := 1 - \prod_{u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d : 0 < \|v-u\| \le t} (1 - U_{u,v}). \tag{2.4}$$

Then $(V_u)_{u\in\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d}$ are a family of independent Bernoulli variables with parameter p_ν. Also, $(W_v)_{v\in\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d}$ are a family of independent Bernoulli variables with parameter

$$q := 1 - (1 - (p_\nu/p_\lambda)^{1/\Delta})^\Delta < 1, \tag{2.5}$$

and are independent of $(T_u, u \in \varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d)$.

Since $\mathbb{P}_{p_\nu}[D_1] = 1$, with probability 1 there exists an infinite sequence $u_1, u_2, \ldots$ of distinct elements of $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $u_i \sim u_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and with $V_{u_i} = 1$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By definition of the relation $\sim$, we can choose sequence $v_1, v_2, \ldots$ of elements of $\varepsilon\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\max(\|v_i - u_i\|, \|v_i - u_{i+1}\|) \le t$. Then for each i, since $V_{u_i} = 1$ we have $U_{u_i,v_i} = 1$, and therefore $W_{v_i} = 1$; also $T_{u_i} = 1$. Hence, (2.1) holds as required, establishing that $\mu_c(r, \lambda) < \infty$. This completes the proof of part (i).

For part (ii), we need to quantify the preceding argument. First note that the value of μ associated with q given by (2.5) (i.e. with $p_\mu = q$) has $\exp(-\mu\varepsilon^d) = (1 - (p_\nu/p_\lambda)^{1/\Delta})^\Delta$, so that since $\varepsilon^d\Delta \le \pi_d r^d$ by (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_c(r, \lambda) \le \mu &= \varepsilon^{-d}\Delta \log\left(\frac{1}{1 - (p_\nu/p_\lambda)^{1/\Delta}}\right)\\ &\le \varepsilon^{-2d}\pi_d r^d \log\left(\frac{1}{1 - (p_\nu/p_\lambda)^{(\varepsilon/r)^d/\pi_d}}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

From now on set $\lambda_c := \lambda_c(2r)$, and set $\lambda = \lambda_c + \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. We need to choose $s < r$ and $\nu < \lambda$ such that $\mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\nu, 2s) \in \mathcal{I}] = 1$. Choose $\alpha, \beta > 0$ with $\alpha + \beta < 1$, and also let $\alpha' \in (0, \alpha)$ and $\beta' \in (0, \beta)$. Set

$$s := r(1 + \alpha\delta/\lambda_c)^{-1/d}; \qquad \nu := \lambda_c + (1 - \beta)\delta.$$

By scaling (see Proposition 2.11 of [5]) and our choice of s, we have

$$\lambda_c(2s) = (r/s)^d\lambda_c(2r) = \lambda_c + \alpha\delta, \tag{2.7}$$

and hence $\nu > \lambda_c(2s)$ so $\mathbb{P}[G(\mathcal{P}_\nu, 2s) \in \mathcal{I}] = 1$, as required.

Our choice of ε in the discretization needs to satisfy

$$\varepsilon \le \frac{r - s}{2\sqrt{d}} = \frac{r}{2\sqrt{d}}\left[1 - \left(1 + \frac{\alpha\delta}{\lambda_c}\right)^{-1/d}\right], \tag{2.8}$$

and the right hand side of (2.8) is asymptotic to $\alpha r\delta/(2d^{3/2}\lambda_c)$ as $\delta \to 0$. Hence, taking $\varepsilon = \alpha' r\delta/(2d^{3/2}\lambda_c)$, we have (2.8) provided $\delta \le \delta_1$, for some fixed $\delta_1 > 0$. Also,

$$\frac{p_\nu}{p_\lambda} \le \frac{\varepsilon^d\nu}{\varepsilon^d\lambda\exp(-\varepsilon^d\lambda)} = \left(\frac{\lambda_c + (1 - \beta)\delta}{\lambda_c + \delta}\right)\exp(\varepsilon^d\lambda) \tag{2.9}$$

and so by Taylor expansion, there is some $\delta_2 > 0$ such that provided $0 < \delta \leq \delta_2$, taking $\varepsilon = \alpha' r\delta/(2d^{3/2}\lambda_c)$ we have

$$\left(\frac{p_\nu}{p_\lambda}\right)^{(\varepsilon/r)^d/\pi_d} \leq 1 - \beta'\delta\varepsilon^d/(\pi_d r^d \lambda_c) = 1 - \frac{\beta'\delta^{d+1}}{\pi_d \lambda_c (2d^{3/2}\lambda_c/\alpha')^d}.$$

Therefore by (2.6), for $0 < \delta \leq \min(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ we have

$$\mu_c(r,\lambda) \leq \left(\frac{2d^{3/2}\lambda_c}{r\delta\alpha'}\right)^{2d} \pi_d r^d \log[\pi_d \lambda_c (2d^{3/2}\lambda_c/\alpha')^d (1/\beta')\delta^{-d-1}]$$

and since we can take α' arbitrarily close to 1, (1.2) follows, completing the proof.

For a given value of λ with $\lambda = \lambda_c(2r) + \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$, an explicit upper bound for $\mu_c(r,\lambda)$ could be computed as follows. Choose $\alpha, \beta > 0$ with $\alpha + \beta < 1$, and let ε be given by the right hand side of (2.8). Then a numerical upper bound for $\mu_c(r,\lambda)$ can be obtained by computing the right hand side of (2.6). To make this bound as small as possible (given α), we make ν as small as we can, i.e. make β approach $1-\alpha$ and ν approach $\lambda_c + \alpha\delta$. Taking this limit and then optimizing further over α gives us the upper bound

$$\mu_c(r,\lambda) \leq \inf_{\alpha \in (0,1)} \varepsilon(\alpha)^{-2d} \pi_d r^d \log\left(\frac{1}{1 - (p_{\lambda_c + \alpha\delta}/p_\lambda)^{(\varepsilon(\alpha)/r)^d/\pi_d}}\right), \tag{2.10}$$

with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\alpha)$ given by the right side of (2.8).

3 Connectivity: proof of Theorem 1.2

Throughout this section we assume $d = 2$. All asymptotics are as $n \to \infty$. Given $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ we shall sometimes write $a \vee b$ for $\max(a,b)$ and $a \wedge b$ for $\min(a,b)$. Fix $\tau > 0$. Given τ and r_n, let δ_n denote the minimum degree of $\mathcal{G}^1(n,\tau,r_n)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/\tau)$. If $n\pi r_n^2/\log n = \alpha$, $n \geq 2$, then almost surely, $\delta_n = 0$ for all but finitely many n.*

Proof. See [3, Proposition 5.1].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1/4)$. If $n\pi r_n^2/\log n = \alpha, n \geq 2$, then almost surely, $\delta_n = 0$ for all but finitely many n.*

Proof. By [6, Theorem 7.8], for this choice of r_n, almost surely the minimum degree of the (one-type) geometric graph $G(\mathcal{P}_n^F, 2r_n)$ is zero for all but finitely many n, and therefore so is the minimum degree of $\mathcal{G}^1(n,\tau,r_n)$. □

Corollary 3.1. *Let $d = 2$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ we have almost surely that $n\pi(\rho_n(\tau))^2/\log n > (1-\varepsilon)\max(1/4, 1/\tau)$ for all but finitely many n.*

Proof. Assume $\varepsilon < 1$. For $n \geq 2$, set $r_n = ((1-\varepsilon)(1/4 \vee 1/\tau)\log n/(n\pi))^{1/2}$, so $n\pi r_n^2/\log n = (1-\varepsilon)(1/4 \vee 1/\tau)$. Let δ_n be the minimum degree of $\mathcal{G}^1(n, \tau, r_n)$. If the minimum degree of a graph of order greater than 1 is zero, then it is not connected; hence

$$\begin{aligned}\{n\pi(\rho_n(\tau))^2/\log n \leq (1-\varepsilon)(\frac{1}{4} \vee \frac{1}{\tau})\} &= \{\mathcal{G}^1(n, \tau, r_n) \in \mathcal{K}\} \\ &\subset \{\delta_n > 0\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_n^F([0,1]^2) \leq 1\},\end{aligned}$$

which occurs only finitely often almost surely, by Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2. □

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.2, it suffices to prove the following:

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose for some fixed α that $(r_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is such that for all $n \geq 2$,*

$$n\pi r_n^2/\log n = \alpha > \max(1/\tau, 1/4). \tag{3.1}$$

Then almost surely $\mathcal{G}^1(n, \tau, r_n) \in \mathcal{K}$ for all but finitely many n.

The proof of this requires a series of lemmas. It proceeds by discretization of space. Assume α and r_n are given, satisfying (3.1). Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, 1/99)$ be chosen in such a way that for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$ we have

$$\alpha\tau(1 - 12\varepsilon) > 1 + \varepsilon; \tag{3.2}$$

$$\alpha(4 - 12\varepsilon(3 + \tau)) > 1 + \varepsilon. \tag{3.3}$$

Given n, partition $[0,1]^2$ into squares of side $\varepsilon_n r_n$ with ε_n chosen so that $\varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_n < 1/99$ and $1/(\varepsilon_n r_n) \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n$ satisfies (3.2) and (3.3); this is possible for all large enough n, say for $n \geq n_0$. In the sequel we assume $n \geq n_0$ and often write just ε for ε_n.

Let $\mathcal{L}_n$ be the set of centres of the squares in this partition (a finite lattice). Then $|\mathcal{L}_n| = \Theta(n/\log n)$. List the squares as $Q_i, 1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{L}_n|$, and the corresponding centres of squares (i.e., the elements of $\mathcal{L}_n$) as $q_i, 1 \leq i \leq |\mathcal{L}_n|$.

Given a set $\mathcal{X} \subset [0,1]^2$, define the *projection of $\mathcal{X}$ onto $\mathcal{L}_n$* to be the set of $q_i \in \mathcal{L}_n$ such that $\mathcal{X} \cap Q_i \neq \emptyset$. Given also $\mathcal{Y} \subset [0,1]^2$, define the projection of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ onto $\mathcal{L}_n$ to be the pair $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}')$, where $\mathcal{X}'$ is the projection of $\mathcal{X}$ onto $\mathcal{L}_n$ and $\mathcal{Y}'$ is the projection of $\mathcal{Y}$ onto $\mathcal{L}_n$. We refer to $|\mathcal{X}'| + |\mathcal{Y}'|$ (respectively $|\mathcal{X}'|$, $|\mathcal{Y}'|$) as the *order* of the projection of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ (respectively of $\mathcal{X}$, of $\mathcal{Y}$) onto $\mathcal{L}_n$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are finite subsets of $[0,1]^2$, such that $G(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, r_n)$ is connected. Let $(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}')$ be the projection of $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ onto $\mathcal{L}_n$. Then the bipartite geometric graph $G(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}', r_n(1+2\varepsilon_n))$ is connected.*

Proof. If $q_i, q_j \in \mathcal{L}_n$ and $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, with $\|X - Y\| \leq r_n$, then by the triangle inequality we have

$$\|q_i - q_j\| \leq \|X - q_i\| + \|X - Y\| + \|Y - q_j\| \leq r_n(1 + 2\varepsilon)$$

and therefore since $G(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, r_n)$ is connected, so is $G(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}', r_n(1+2\varepsilon))$. □

Given $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{A}_{n,m}$ denote the set of pairs (σ_1, σ_2) with each $\sigma_j \subset \mathcal{L}_n$, with $|\sigma_1| + |\sigma_2| = m$ and $|\sigma_1| \geq 1$, such that $G(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, r_n(1+2\varepsilon_n))$ is connected; these may be viewed as 'bipartite lattice animals'.

Let $\mathcal{A}^2_{n,m}$ be the set of $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,m}$ such that all elements of $\sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2$ are distant at least $2r_n$ from the boundary of $[0,1]^2$.

Let $\mathcal{A}^1_{n,m}$ be the set of $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,m}$ such that $\sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2$ is distant less than $2r_n$ from *just one edge* of $[0,1]^2$.

Let $\mathcal{A}^0_{n,m} := \mathcal{A}_{n,m} \setminus (\mathcal{A}^2_{n,m} \cup \mathcal{A}^1_{n,m})$, the set of $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,m}$ such that $\sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2$ is distant less than $2r_n$ from *two edges* of $[0,1]^2$ (i.e. near a corner of $[0,1]^2$).

Lemma 3.4. *Given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is constant $C = C(m)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$ we have*

$$|\mathcal{A}_{n,m}| \leq C(n/\log n), \qquad |\mathcal{A}^1_{n,m}| \leq C(n/\log n)^{1/2}, \qquad |\mathcal{A}^0_{n,m}| \leq C.$$

Proof. Fix m. Consider how many ways there are to choose $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}_{n,m}$.

There are at most $|\mathcal{L}_n|$ choices, and hence $O(n/\log n)$ choices, for the first element of σ_1 in the lexicographic ordering. Having chosen the first element of σ_1, there are a bounded number of ways to choose the rest of σ.

Consider how many ways there are to choose $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}^1_{n,m}$. In this case there are $O(r_n^{-1}) = O((n/\log n)^{1/2})$ ways to choose the first element of σ_1 (distant at most $2r_n$ from the boundary of $[0,1]^2$), and then a bounded number of ways to choose the rest of σ.

Finally consider how many ways there are to choose $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}^0_{n,m}$. In this case there are $O(1)$ ways to choose the first element of σ_1, and then a bounded number of ways to choose the rest of σ. □

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set $\nu(n) := n^{\lceil 4/\varepsilon_0 \rceil}$. Note that $\nu(n+1) \sim \nu(n)$ and $r_{\nu(n+1)} \sim r_{\nu(n)}$ as $n \to \infty$, and that r_n is monotone decreasing in n, $n \geq 3$.

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\nu(n) \geq n_0$, and given $\sigma_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_{\nu(n)}$ and $\sigma_2 \subset \mathcal{L}_{\nu(n)}$, let $E_{(\sigma_1,\sigma_2)}$ be the event that there exists some $n' \in \mathbb{N} \cap [\nu(n), \nu(n+1))$ such that there is a

component (U, V) of $G(\mathcal{P}^F_{n'}, \mathcal{Q}^F_{\tau n'}, r_{n'})$ such that (σ_1, σ_2) is the projection of (U, V) onto $\mathcal{L}_{\nu(n)}$.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $r > 0$ let $B(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|y - x\| \le r\}$. Also let $B_+(r)$ be the right half of $B((0,0), r)$, and let $B_-(r)$ be the left half of $B((0,0), r)$. Let $v_2(\cdot)$ denote Lebesgue measure, defined on Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Lemma 3.5. *There exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \ge n_1$ we have*

$$\sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}^2_{\nu(n),m}} (\mathbb{P}[E_\sigma]) \le \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)}; \tag{3.4}$$

$$\sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}^1_{\nu(n),m}} (\mathbb{P}[E_\sigma]) \le \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)/2}; \tag{3.5}$$

$$\sup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}^0_{\nu(n),m}} (\mathbb{P}[E_\sigma]) \le \nu(n)^{-1/20}. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. Choose n_1 so that $\nu(n_1) \ge n_0$ and also $(1 - \varepsilon_0) r_{\nu(n)} < r_{\nu(n+1)}$ for $n \ge n_1$. Assume from now on that $n \ge n_1$.

Given $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathcal{A}_{\nu(n),m}$, let q_i (respectively q_j) be the lexicographically first (resp. last) element of σ_1. Let σ_2^- be the set of $q_k \in \sigma_2 \cap B(q_i, r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 4\varepsilon))$ lying strictly to the left of q_i (in this proof, $\varepsilon := \varepsilon_{\nu(n)}$). Let σ_2^+ be the set of $q_k \in \sigma_2 \cap B(q_j, r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 4\varepsilon))$ lying strictly to the right of q_j. Let $\tilde{\sigma}_2^+ := \sigma_2^+ \oplus [-\varepsilon r_{\nu(n)}/2, \varepsilon r_{\nu(n)}/2]^2$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_2^- := \sigma_2^- \oplus [-\varepsilon r_{\nu(n)}/2, \varepsilon r_{\nu(n)}/2]^2$ (see Figure 1).

Let B_σ^- be the part of $B(q_i, r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 5\varepsilon))$ lying strictly to the left of Q_i. Let B_σ^+ be the part of $B(q_j, r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 5\varepsilon))$ lying strictly to the right of Q_j.

Given σ, define the events A_σ^+ and A_σ^- by

$$A_\sigma^+ := \{\mathcal{Q}^F_{\tau\nu(n+1)}(B_\sigma^+ \setminus \tilde{\sigma}_2^+) = 0\} \cap \{\mathcal{P}^F_{\nu(n+1)}(\tilde{\sigma}_2^+ \oplus B_+(r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 3\varepsilon))) = 0\};$$
$$A_\sigma^- := \{\mathcal{Q}^F_{\tau\nu(n+1)}(B_\sigma^- \setminus \tilde{\sigma}_2^-) = 0\} \cap \{\mathcal{P}^F_{\nu(n+1)}(\tilde{\sigma}_2^- \oplus B_-(r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 3\varepsilon))) = 0\}.$$

See Figure 1 for an illustration of event A_σ^+. Note that events A_σ^+ and A_σ^- are independent.

Suppose k is such that $Q_k \cap B_\sigma^+ \ne \emptyset$. Then by the triangle equality,

$$\|q_k - q_j\| \le r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 5\varepsilon) + \varepsilon r_{\nu(n)} = r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 4\varepsilon). \tag{3.7}$$

Similarly, if $Q_k \cap B_\sigma^- \ne \emptyset$ then $\|q_k - q_i\| \le r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 4\varepsilon)$.

By our coupling of Poisson processes, for $\nu(n) \le n' < \nu(n+1)$ we have $\mathcal{P}_{\nu(n)} \subset \mathcal{P}_{n'} \subset \mathcal{P}_{\nu(n+1)}$. Also if $x \in Q_k$ and $y \in Q_i$ with $\|q_i - q_k\| \le r_{\nu(n)}(1 - 3\varepsilon)$, then by the triangle inequality and our condition on n_1 we have $\|x - y\| \le r_{\nu(n)}(1 - \varepsilon) \le r_{n'}$ for all $n' \in [\nu(n), \nu(n+1))$. Hence by the argument at (3.7), for any $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}_{n,m}$ we have $E_\sigma \subset A_\sigma^+ \cap A_\sigma^-$.



Figure 1: The dots are the points of σ_1, and the crosses are the points of σ_2. The grey squares are the set $\tilde{\sigma}_2^+$ (since $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n < 1/99$, they should really be smaller). Event A_σ^+ says that the black region contains no points of $\mathcal{Q}^F_{\tau\nu(n+1)}$ and the grey region (partly obscured by the black region) contains no points of $\mathcal{P}^F_{\nu(n+1)}$.

First we prove (3.5). Take $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}^1_{\nu(n),m}$. Consider just the case where σ is near to the left edge of $[0,1]^2$ (the other three cases are treated similarly). If $\sigma_2^+ = \emptyset$, then $A_\sigma^+ = \{\mathcal{Q}^F_{\tau\nu(n+1)}(B_\sigma^+) = 0\}$, and in this case we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[A_\sigma^+] &\leq \exp(-\tau\nu(n)(\pi(r_{\nu(n)}(1-5\varepsilon))^2 - 2\varepsilon r^2_{\nu(n)})/2) \\ &\leq \exp\left[-\tau\alpha(\log\nu(n))(1-12\varepsilon)/2\right] \leq \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where the last inequality comes from (3.2). This proves (3.5) for this case.

Suppose instead that $\sigma_2^+ \neq \emptyset$. Then $\tilde{\sigma}_2^+ \subset \{q_j\} \oplus B_+(r_{\nu(n)}(1-3\varepsilon))$ so that $v_2(\tilde{\sigma}_2^+) \leq \pi r^2_{\nu(n)}(1-3\varepsilon)^2/2$. Let $s \in [0,1]$ be chosen such that $v_2(\tilde{\sigma}_2^+) = s^2\pi r^2_{\nu(n)}(1-3\varepsilon)^2/2$. Then by the Brunn-Minkowski inequality (see e.g. [6]),

$$v_2(\tilde{\sigma}_2^+ \oplus B_+(r_{\nu(n)}(1-3\varepsilon))) \geq (\pi r^2_{\nu(n)}/2)(1-3\varepsilon)^2(1+s)^2,$$

and also $v_2(B_\sigma^+) \geq \pi r^2_{\nu(n)}((1-5\varepsilon)^2 - 2\varepsilon)/2$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[A_\sigma^+] &\leq \exp(-\tau\nu(n)v_2(B_\sigma^+ \setminus \tilde{\sigma}_2^+) - \nu(n)v_2(\tilde{\sigma}_2^+ \oplus B_+(r_{\nu(n)}(1-3\varepsilon)))) \\ &\leq \exp(-(\nu(n)\pi r^2_{\nu(n)}/2)[\tau((1-5\varepsilon)^2 - 2\varepsilon - s^2(1-3\varepsilon)^2) + (1+s)^2(1-3\varepsilon)^2]) \\ &\leq \exp(-(\alpha/2)(\log\nu(n))g_\tau(s)),\end{aligned}$$

where we set $g_\tau(s) := (\tau+1+2s)(1-12\varepsilon)+s^2(1-3\varepsilon)^2(1-\tau)$. If $\tau \le 1$ then $g_\tau(s)$ is minimised over $s \in [0,1]$ at $s=0$. If $\tau > 1$, then $g_\tau(\cdot)$ is concave, so its minimum over $[0,1]$ is achieved at $s=0$ or $s=1$; also in this case $g_\tau(1) \ge (3+\tau)(1-12\varepsilon)+1-\tau$. Hence, using (3.2) and (3.3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[A_\sigma^+] &\le \exp(-(\alpha/2)(\log \nu(n)) \min[(1+\tau)(1-12\varepsilon), 4-12\varepsilon(3+\tau)]) \\ &\le \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

completing the proof of (3.5).

Now we prove (3.4). If $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}^2_{n,m}$ then $\mathbb{P}[A_\sigma^+] \le \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)/2}$ by (3.8) and (3.9), and $\mathbb{P}[A_\sigma^-] \le \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)/2}$ similarly. Therefore $\mathbb{P}[E_\sigma] \le \mathbb{P}[A_\sigma^+ \cap A_\sigma^-] \le \nu(n)^{-1-\varepsilon}$, completing the proof of (3.4).

To prove (3.6), let $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}^0_{n,m}$. Assume σ is near the lower left corner of $[0,1]^2$ (the other cases are treated similarly). First suppose $\sigma_2^+ = \emptyset$. Then $\mathbb{P}[E_\sigma] \le \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{Q}^F_{\tau\nu(n+1)}(B_\sigma^+) = 0]$ and since the upper half of B_σ^+ is contained in $[0,1]^2$, in this case

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[E_\sigma] &\le \exp(-\tau\nu(n)\pi r^2_{\nu(n)}[((1-5\varepsilon)^2/4) - \varepsilon/2]) \\ &\le \nu(n)^{-\alpha\tau(1-12\varepsilon)/4} \le \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)/4}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Now suppose $\sigma_2^+ \neq \emptyset$. Let q_ℓ be the last element (in the lexicographic order) of σ_2^+. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[E_\sigma] &\le \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{P}^F_{\nu(n+1)}(\{q_\ell\} \oplus B_+(r_{\nu(n)}(1-3\varepsilon))) = 0] \\ \le \exp(-\nu(n)\pi r^2_{\nu(n)}(1-3\varepsilon)^2/4) &\le \nu(n)^{-\alpha(1-6\varepsilon)/4} \le \nu(n)^{-1/20},\end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality we used the fact that $\alpha > 1/4$ and $\varepsilon < 1/99$. Together with (3.10) this demonstrates (3.6). □

For $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $r > 0$, let $\mathcal{K}_{n,m}(r)$ be the class of bipartite point sets $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ in $[0,1]^2$ such that $G(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, r)$ has at least one component, the vertex-set of which has projection onto $\mathcal{L}_n$ of order m and contains at least one element of $\mathcal{X}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then almost surely, for all but finitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $(\mathcal{P}^F_{n'}, \mathcal{Q}^F_{\tau n'}) \notin \mathcal{K}_{\nu(n),m}(r_{n'})$ for all $n' \in \mathbb{N} \cap [\nu(n), \nu(n+1))$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5, for $n \ge n_1$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\cup_{\nu(n) \le n' < \nu(n+1)} \{(\mathcal{P}^F_n, \mathcal{Q}^F_{\tau n}) \in \mathcal{K}_{\nu(n),m}(r_{n'})\}] \le \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{A}_{\nu(n),m}} \mathbb{P}(E_\sigma)$$

$$\le |\mathcal{A}^2_{\nu(n),m}| \times \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)} + |\mathcal{A}^1_{\nu(n),m}| \times \nu(n)^{-(1+\varepsilon)/2} + |\mathcal{A}^0_{\nu(n),m}| \times \nu(n)^{-1/20}$$

and using Lemma 3.4 and the definition $\nu(n) := n^{\lceil 4/\varepsilon_0 \rceil}$, and recalling that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_n \geq \varepsilon_0$ as described just after (3.3), we find that this probability is $O(n^{-2})$, so is summable in n; then the result follows by the Borel-Cantelli lemma. □

Lemma 3.7. (see [6, Lemma 9.1].) *For any two closed connected subsets A, B of $[0,1]^2$ with union $A \cup B = [0,1]^2$, the intersection $A \cap B$ is connected.*

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $k(n)$ be the choice of $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\nu(k) \leq n < \nu(k+1)$. Also, given $K \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F_K(n)$ be the event that $G(\mathcal{P}_n^F, \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}^F, r_n)$ has two or more components with projections onto $\mathcal{L}_{\nu(k(n))}$ of order greater than K.

Lemma 3.8. *There exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that with probability 1 the event $F_K(n)$ occurs for only finitely many n.*

Proof. Suppose $F_K(n)$ occurs. Then there exist distinct components $U = (U_1, U_2)$, and $V = (V_1, V_2)$ in $G(\mathcal{P}_n^F, \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}^F, r_n)$, both with projections onto $\mathcal{L}_{\nu(k(n))}$ of order greater than K. Let U' be the union of closed Voronoi cells in $[0,1]^2$ (relative to $\mathcal{P}_n \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}$) of vertices of U, and let V' be the union of closed Voronoi cells in $[0,1]^2$ of vertices of V.

The interior of U' and the interior of V' are disjoint subsets of $[0,1]^2$, and we now show that they are connected sets. Suppose $X \in U_1, Y \in U_2$ with $\|X - Y\| \leq r_n$; then we claim the entire line segment $[X, Y]$ is contained in the interior of U'. Indeed, let $z \in [X, Y]$, and suppose z lies in the closed Voronoi cell of some $W \in \mathcal{P}_n^F \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}^F$. If $W \in \mathcal{P}_n^F$ then

$$\|W - Y\| \leq \|W - z\| + \|z - Y\| \leq \|X - z\| + \|z - Y\| = \|X - Y\| \leq r_n$$

so $W \in U$. Similarly, if $W \in \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}^F$ then $\|W - X\| \leq r_n$ so again $W \in U$. Hence the interior of U' is connected, and likewise for V'.

Let $\tilde{V}$ be the closure of the component of $[0,1]^2 \setminus U'$, containing the interior of V', and let $\tilde{U}$ be the closure of $[0,1]^2 \setminus \tilde{V}$ (essentially, this is the set obtained by filling in the holes of U' that are not connected to V').

Then $\tilde{U}, \tilde{V}$ are closed connected sets, whose union is $[0,1]^2$. Therefore by Lemma 3.7, the set $\partial U := \tilde{U} \cap \tilde{V}$ is connected. Note that ∂U is part of the boundary of U' (it is the 'exterior boundary' of U' relative to V').

Let T be the set of cube centres $q_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\nu(k(n))}$ such that $Q_i \cap (\partial U) \neq \emptyset$. Then T is $*$-connected in $\mathcal{L}_{\nu(k(n))}$, i.e. for any $x, y \in T$, there is a path $(x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ with $x_0 = x$, $x_k = y$ and $x_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\nu(k(n))}$ and $\|x_i - x_{i-1}\|_\infty = \varepsilon r_{\nu(k(n))}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ (here $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\nu(k(n))}$.)

Also, for each $q_i \in T$ we claim $\mathcal{P}_n(Q_i)\mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}(Q_i) = 0$. Indeed, suppose on the contrary that $\mathcal{P}_n(Q_i)\mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}(Q_i) > 0$. Then all points of $(\mathcal{P}_n \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}) \cap Q_i$ lie in the same component of $G(\mathcal{P}_n^F, \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}^F, r_n)$. If they are all in U, then Q_i, and all neighbouring Q_j

(including diagonal neighbours) are contained in U'. If all points of $(\mathcal{P}_n \cup \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}) \cap Q_i$ are not in U, then Q_i, and all neighbouring Q_j (including diagonal neighbours) are disjoint from U'. Therefore $(\partial U) \cap Q_i = \emptyset$.

We now prove the isoperimetric inequality

$$|T| \geq (K/2)^{1/2}. \tag{3.11}$$

To see this, define the *width* of a nonempty closed set $A \subset [0,1]^2$ to be the maximum difference between x-coordinates of points in A, and the *height* of A to be the maximum difference between y-coordinates of points in A.

We claim that either the height or the width of ∂U is at least $(K/2)^{1/2} \varepsilon r_{\nu(k(n))}$. Indeed, if not, then ∂U is contained in some square of side $(K/2)^{1/2} \varepsilon r_{\nu(k(n))}$, and then either U' or V' is contained in that square, so either U or V is contained in that square, contradicting the assumption that the projections of U and of V onto $\mathcal{L}_{\nu(k(n))}$ have order greater than K. For example, if the projection of U has order greater than K, then at least one of U_1 and U_2, say U_1, has projection of order greater than $K/2$, and then the union of squares of side $\varepsilon r_{\nu(k(n))}$ centred at vertices in the projection of U_1 has total area greater than $(K/2)\varepsilon^2 r^2_{\nu(k(n))}$, so is not contained in any square of side $(K/2)^{1/2} \varepsilon r_{\nu(k(n))}$. Thus the claim holds, and then (3.11) follows by the $*$-connectivity of T.

For $\nu, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{A}'_{\nu,m}$ be the set of $*$-connected subsets of $\mathcal{L}_\nu$ with m elements. By a similar argument to the proof of Lemma 3.4 (see also [6, Lemma 9.3]), there are finite constants γ and C such that for all $\nu, m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$|\mathcal{A}'_{\nu,m}| \leq C(\nu/\log \nu)\gamma^m. \tag{3.12}$$

Set $\phi_n := \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{P}_n(Q_i)\mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}(Q_i) = 0]$ (which does not depend on i). By the union bound, and (3.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_n &\leq \exp(-n(\varepsilon r_{\nu(k(n))})^2) + \exp(-\tau n(\varepsilon r_{\nu(k(n))})^2) \\
&\leq 2\exp[-(\tau \wedge 1)\varepsilon^2(\alpha/\pi)(n \log \nu(k(n))/\nu(k(n)))] \\
&\leq 2\nu(k(n))^{-(\tau\wedge 1)\varepsilon^2\alpha/\pi} \leq 3n^{-(\tau\wedge 1)\varepsilon^2\alpha/\pi},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds for all large enough n. Using (3.11) and (3.12) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[F_K(n)] &\leq \sum_{m \geq (K/2)^{1/2}} C(\nu(k(n))/\log \nu(k(n)))\gamma^m \phi_n^m \\
&\leq 2Cn\big(3\gamma n^{-\varepsilon^2\alpha(\tau\wedge 1)/\pi}\big)^{(K/2)^{1/2}},
\end{aligned}$$

which is summable in n provided K is chosen so that $\varepsilon^2\pi^{-1}\alpha(\tau \wedge 1)(K/2)^{1/2} > 3$. The result then follows by the Borel-Cantelli lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Choose $K \in \mathbb{N}$ as in Lemma 3.8. Writing 'i.o.' for 'for infinitely many n' (i.e. infinitely often), we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{G}^1(n,\tau,r_n) \notin \mathcal{K} \text{ i.o.}] \leq \left(\sum_{m=1}^{K} \mathbb{P}[(\mathcal{P}_n^F, \mathcal{Q}_{\tau n}^F) \in \mathcal{K}_{\nu(k(n)),m}(r_n) \text{ i.o.}] \right) + \mathbb{P}[F_K(n) \text{ i.o.}].$$

By Lemmas 3.6 and 3.8, this is zero. □

References

[1] Chayes, L. and Schonmann, R. H. (2000). Mixed percolation as a bridge between site and bond percolation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **10**, 1182–1196.

[2] Grimmett, G. (1999). *Percolation.* Second edition. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[3] Iyer, S. K. and Yogeshwaran, D. (2012). Percolation and connectivity in AB random geometric graphs. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **44**, 21-41.

[4] Lorenz, C. D. and Ziff, R. M. (2000). Precise determination of the critical percolation threshold for the three dimensional "Swiss cheese" model using a growth algorithm. *J. Chem. Phys.* **114**, 3659-3661.

[5] Meester, R. and Roy, R. (1996). *Continuum Percolation.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[6] Penrose, M. (2003) *Random Geometric Graphs.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

[7] Pinto, P.C. and Win, Z. Percolation and connectivity in the intrinsically secure communications graph. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **58**, 1716-1730.

[8] Quintanilla, J. A. and Ziff, R. M. (2007). Asymmetry of percolation thresholds of fully penetrable disks with two different radii. *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 051115 [6 pages].

[9] Sarkar, A. and Haenggi, M. (2013) Percolation in the Secrecy Graph. *Discrete Appl. Math.* **161**, 2120-2132.